

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 16 2006

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claim 56 is amended to recite subject matter considered allowable in the Office Action. No new matter has been added. Claims 56-67 are pending. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of and comments in this application.

Claims 56-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Claim 56 has been amended. Particularly, the term "alkyl" has been deleted and the claim now recites that "R1 and R2 are the same or different and each is a saturated hydrocarbon that includes 1 to 30 carbon atoms." Applicants respectfully submit that claim 56 and its dependent claims are definite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 56-60 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and/or (b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bethell et al. (WO 96/07487). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Claim 56 has been amended to accept the Examiner's suggestion of allowable subject matter. Claim 56 is an article that now recites an organic film where R1 and R2 are directly bonded to said Y group and said Y group consists of a single moiety selected from the group consisting of: -CO-; -OSi-; -SiO-; - $\phi$ -NH-; -NH- $\phi$ -; - $\phi$ -CH<sub>2</sub>- $\phi$ -; -CH=N-; -N=CH-; - $\phi$ -CO-; -CO- $\phi$ -; - $\phi$ -CH<sub>2</sub>- $\phi$ -(-CHO)-; - $\phi$ -(-CHO)-CH<sub>2</sub>- $\phi$ -; -NH-CO-NH-; -CO-NH-O-; -O-NH-CO-; -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-NH-; -NH-CH<sub>2</sub>-CHOH-; -CO-O-; -O-CO-; -NH-CO-; and -CO-NH-, where  $\phi$  is a benzene ring. Bethell et al., however does not disclose or suggest the features required by claim 56. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 56 and dependent claims 60 and 63-65 are patentable.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethell et al., as applied above, and further in view of Black et al. (U.S. 2002/0022111A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Claims 61 and 62 depend upon and further limit claim 56, which has been discussed above as being allowable. Likewise, claims 61 and 62 are allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 56. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heath et al. (U.S. 6159620) in view of Bethell et al. as applied above. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained.

Claims 66 and 67 are devices that include the limitations of claim 56, which has been discussed above as being allowable. Likewise, claims 66 and 67 are allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 56. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Favorable consideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If any questions arise regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.



Dated: November 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/baw